

Regenerative real trees

Mathilde WEILL

D.M.A., École normale supérieure, 45 rue d'Ulm, 75005 Paris, France

February 2, 2008

Abstract

In this work, we give a description of all σ -finite measures on the space of rooted compact $\mathbb{R}$ -trees which satisfy a certain regenerative property. We show that any infinite measure which satisfies the regenerative property is the "law" of a Lévy tree, that is, the "law" of a tree-valued random variable that describes the genealogy of a population evolving according to a continuous-state branching process. On the other hand, we prove that a probability measure with the regenerative property must be the law of the genealogical tree associated with a continuous-time discrete-state branching process.

1 Introduction

Galton-Watson trees are well known to be characterized among all random discrete trees by a regenerative property. More precisely, if γ is a probability measure on $\mathbb{Z}_+$, the law Π_γ of the Galton-Watson tree with offspring distribution γ is uniquely determined by the following two conditions: Under the probability measure Π_γ ,

- (i) the ancestor has p children with probability $\gamma(p)$,
- (ii) if $\gamma(p) > 0$, then conditionally on the event that the ancestor has p children, the p subtrees which describe the genealogy of the descendants of these children, are independent and distributed according to Π_γ .

The aim of this work is to study σ -finite measures satisfying an analogue of this property on the space of equivalence classes of rooted compact $\mathbb{R}$ -trees.

An $\mathbb{R}$ -tree is a metric space $(\mathcal{T}, d)$ such that for any two points σ_1 and σ_2 in $\mathcal{T}$, there is a unique arc with endpoints σ_1 and σ_2 , and furthermore this arc is isometric to a compact interval of the real line. In this work, all $\mathbb{R}$ -trees are supposed to be compact. A rooted $\mathbb{R}$ -tree is an $\mathbb{R}$ -tree with a distinguished vertex called the root. Say that two rooted $\mathbb{R}$ -trees

are equivalent if there is a root-preserving isometry that maps one onto the other. It was noted in [8] that the set $\mathbb{T}$ of all equivalence classes of rooted compact $\mathbb{R}$ -trees equipped with the pointed Gromov-Hausdorff distance d_{GH} (see e.g. Chapter 7 in [4]), is a Polish space. Hence it is legitimate to consider random variables with values in $\mathbb{T}$, that is, random $\mathbb{R}$ -trees. A particularly important example is the CRT, which was introduced by Aldous [1], [2] with a different formalism. Striking applications of the concept of random $\mathbb{R}$ -trees can be found in the recent papers [8] and [9].

Let $\mathcal{T}$ be an $\mathbb{R}$ -tree. We write $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T})$ for the height of the $\mathbb{R}$ -tree $\mathcal{T}$, that is the maximal distance from the root to a vertex of $\mathcal{T}$. For every $t \geq 0$, we denote by $\mathcal{T}_{\leq t}$ the set of all vertices of $\mathcal{T}$ which are at distance at most t from the root, and by $\mathcal{T}_{>t}$ the set of all vertices which are at distance greater than t from the root. To each connected component of $\mathcal{T}_{>t}$ there corresponds a "subtree" of $\mathcal{T}$ above level t (see section 2.2.3 for a more precise definition). For every $h > 0$, we define $Z(t, t+h)(\mathcal{T})$ as the number of subtrees of $\mathcal{T}$ above level t with height greater than h .

Let Θ be a σ -finite measure on $\mathbb{T}$, such that $0 < \Theta(\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) > t) < \infty$ for every $t > 0$ and $\Theta(\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) = 0) = 0$. We say that Θ satisfies the regenerative property (R) if the following holds:

- (R) For every $t, h > 0$ and $p \in \mathbb{N}$, under the probability measure $\Theta(\cdot \mid \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) > t)$ and conditionally on the event $\{Z(t, t+h) = p\}$, the p subtrees of $\mathcal{T}$ above level t with height greater than h are independent and distributed according to the probability measure $\Theta(\cdot \mid \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) > h)$.

This is a natural analogue of the regenerative property stated above for Galton-Watson trees. Beware that, unlike the discrete case, there is no natural order on the subtrees above a given level. So, the preceding property should be understood in the sense that the unordered collection of the p subtrees in consideration is distributed as the unordered collection of p independent copies of $\Theta(\cdot \mid \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) > h)$.

Property (R) is known to be satisfied by a wide class of infinite measures on $\mathbb{T}$, namely the "laws" of Lévy trees. Lévy trees have been introduced by T. Duquesne and J.F. Le Gall in [7]. Their precise definition is recalled in section 2.3, but let us immediately give an informal presentation.

Let Y be a critical or subcritical continuous-state branching process. The distribution of Y is characterized by its branching mechanism function ψ . Assume that Y becomes extinct a.s., which is equivalent to the condition $\int_1^\infty \psi(u)^{-1} du < \infty$. The ψ -Lévy tree is a random variable taking values in $(\mathbb{T}, d_{GH})$, which describes the genealogy of a population evolving according to Y and starting with infinitesimally small mass. More precisely, the "law" of the Lévy tree is defined in [7] as a σ -finite measure on the space $(\mathbb{T}, d_{GH})$, such that $0 < \Theta_\psi(\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) > t) < \infty$ for every $t > 0$. As a consequence of Theorem 4.2 of [7], the measure Θ_ψ satisfies Property (R). In the special case $\psi(u) = u^\alpha$, $1 < \alpha \leq 2$ corresponding to the so-called stable trees, this was used by Miermont [12], [13] to introduce and to study certain fragmentation processes.

In the present work we describe all σ -finite measures on $\mathbb{T}$ that satisfy Property (R). We show that the only infinite measures satisfying Property (R) are the measures Θ_ψ associated with Lévy trees. On the other hand, if Θ is a finite measure satisfying Property (R), we can obviously restrict our attention to the case $\Theta(\mathbb{T}) = 1$ and we obtain that Θ must be the law of the genealogical tree associated with a continuous-time discrete-state branching process.

Theorem 1.1 *Let Θ be an infinite measure on $(\mathbb{T}, d_{GH})$ such that $\Theta(\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) = 0) = 0$ and $0 < \Theta(\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) > t) < +\infty$ for every $t > 0$. Assume that Θ satisfies Property (R). Then, there exists a continuous-state branching process, whose branching mechanism is denoted by ψ , which becomes extinct almost surely, such that $\Theta = \Theta_\psi$.*

Theorem 1.2 *Let Θ be a probability measure on $(\mathbb{T}, d_{GH})$ such that $\Theta(\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) = 0) = 0$ and $0 < \Theta(\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) > t)$ for every $t > 0$. Assume that Θ satisfies Property (R). Then there exists $a > 0$ and a critical or subcritical probability measure γ on $\mathbb{Z}_+ \setminus \{1\}$ such that Θ is the law of the genealogical tree for a discrete-space continuous-time branching process with offspring distribution γ , where branchings occur at rate a .*

In other words, Θ in Theorem 1.2 can be described in the following way: There exists a real random variable J such that under Θ :

- (i) J is distributed according to the exponential distribution with parameter a and there exists $\sigma_J \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $\mathcal{T}_{\leq J} = [[\rho, \sigma_J]]$,
- (ii) the number of subtrees above level J is distributed according to γ and is independent of J ,
- (iii) for every $p \geq 2$, conditionally on J and given the event that the number of subtrees above level J is equal to p , these p subtrees are independent and distributed according to Θ .

Theorem 1.1 is proved in section 3, after some preliminary results have been established in section 2. A key idea of the proof is to use the regenerative property to embed discrete Galton-Watson trees in our random real trees (Lemma 3.3). A technical difficulty comes from the fact that real trees are not ordered whereas Galton-Watson trees are usually defined as random ordered discrete trees (cf subsection 2.2.4 below). To overcome this difficulty, we assign a random ordering to the discrete trees embedded in real trees. Another major ingredient of the proof of Theorem 1.1 is the construction of a "local time" L_t at every level t of a random real tree governed by Θ . The local time process is then shown to be a continuous-state branching process with branching mechanism ψ , which makes it possible to identify Θ with Θ_ψ . Theorem 1.2 is proved in section 4. Several arguments are similar to the proof of Theorem 1.1, so that we have skipped some details.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we recall some basic facts about branching processes, $\mathbb{R}$ -trees and Lévy trees.

2.1 Branching processes

2.1.1 Continuous-state branching processes

A (continuous-time) continuous-state branching process (in short a CSBP) is a Markov process $Y = (Y_t, t \geq 0)$ with values in the positive half-line $[0, +\infty)$, with a Feller semigroup $(Q_t, t \geq 0)$ satisfying the following branching property: For every $t \geq 0$ and $x, x' \geq 0$,

$$Q_t(x, \cdot) * Q_t(x', \cdot) = Q_t(x + x', \cdot).$$

Informally, this means that the union of two independent populations started respectively at x and x' will evolve like a single population started at $x + x'$.

We will consider only the critical or subcritical case, meaning that, for every $t \geq 0$ and $x \geq 0$,

$$\int_{[0, +\infty)} y Q_t(x, dy) \leq 1.$$

Then, if we exclude the trivial case where $Q_t(x, \cdot) = \delta_0$ for every $t > 0$ and $x \geq 0$, the Laplace functional of the semigroup can be written in the following form: For every $\lambda \geq 0$,

$$\int_{[0, +\infty)} e^{-\lambda y} Q_t(x, dy) = \exp(-xu(t, \lambda)),$$

where the function $(u(t, \lambda), t \geq 0, \lambda \geq 0)$ is determined by the differential equation

$$\frac{du(t, \lambda)}{dt} = -\psi(u(t, \lambda)), \quad u(0, \lambda) = \lambda,$$

and $\psi : \mathbb{R}_+ \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is of the form

$$\psi(u) = \alpha u + \beta u^2 + \int_{(0, +\infty)} (e^{-ur} - 1 + ur) \pi(dr), \quad (1)$$

where $\alpha, \beta \geq 0$ and π is a σ -finite measure on $(0, +\infty)$ such that $\int_{(0, +\infty)} (r \wedge r^2) \pi(dr) < \infty$. The process Y is called the ψ -continuous-state branching process (in short the ψ -CSBP).

Continuous-state branching processes may also be obtained as weak limits of rescaled Galton-Watson processes. We recall that an offspring distribution is a probability measure on $\mathbb{Z}_+$. An offspring distribution μ is said to be critical if $\sum_{i \geq 0} i\mu(i) = 1$ and subcritical if $\sum_{i \geq 0} i\mu(i) < 1$. Let us state a result that can be derived from [10] and [11].

Theorem 2.1 *Let $(\mu_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of offspring distributions. For every $n \geq 1$, denote by X^n a Galton-Watson process with offspring distribution μ_n , started at $X_0^n = n$. Let $(m_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a nondecreasing sequence of positive integers converging to infinity. We define a sequence of processes $(Y^n)_{n \geq 1}$ by setting, for every $t \geq 0$ and $n \geq 1$,*

$$Y_t^n = n^{-1} X_{[m_n t]}^n.$$

Assume that, for every $t \geq 0$, the sequence $(Y_t^n)_{n \geq 1}$ converges in distribution to Y_t where $Y = (Y_t, t \geq 0)$ is an almost surely finite process such that $\mathbb{P}(Y_\delta > 0) > 0$ for some $\delta > 0$. Then, Y is a continuous-state branching process and the sequence of processes $(Y^n)_{n \geq 1}$ converges to Y in distribution in the Skorokhod space $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+)$.

PROOF: It follows from the proof of Theorem 1 of [11] that Y is a CSBP. Then, thanks to Theorem 2 of [11], there exists a sequence of offspring distributions $(\nu_n)_{n \geq 1}$ and a nondecreasing sequence of positive integers $(c_n)_{n \geq 1}$ such that we can construct for every $n \geq 1$ a Galton-Watson process Z^n started at c_n and with offspring distribution ν_n satisfying

$$(c_n^{-1} Z_{[nt]}^n, t \geq 0) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{d} (Y_t, t \geq 0),$$

where the symbol $\xrightarrow{d}$ indicates convergence in distribution in $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+)$.

Let $(m_{n_k})_{k \geq 1}$ be a strictly increasing subsequence of $(m_n)_{n \geq 1}$. For $n \geq 1$, we set $B^n = X^{n_k}$ and $b_n = n_k$ if $n = m_{n_k}$ for some $k \geq 1$, and we set $B^n = Z^n$ and $b_n = c_n$ if there is no $k \geq 1$ such that $n = m_{n_k}$. Then, for every $t \geq 0$, $(b_n^{-1} B_{[nt]}^n)_{n \geq 1}$ converges in distribution to Y_t . Applying Theorem 4.1 of [10], we obtain that

$$(b_n^{-1} B_{[nt]}^n, t \geq 0) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{d} (Y_t, t \geq 0).$$

In particular, we have,

$$(Y_t^{n_k}, t \geq 0) \xrightarrow[k \rightarrow \infty]{d} (Y_t, t \geq 0). \quad (2)$$

As (2) holds for every strictly increasing subsequence of $(m_n)_{n \geq 1}$, we obtain the desired result. $\square$

2.1.2 Discrete-state branching processes

A (continuous-time) discrete-state branching process (in short DSBP) is a continuous-time Markov chain $Y = (Y_t, t \geq 0)$ with values in $\mathbb{Z}_+$ whose transition probabilities $(P_t(i, j), t \geq 0, i, j \geq 0)$ satisfy the following branching property: For every $i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $t \geq 0$ and $|s| \leq 1$,

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} P_t(i, j) s^j = \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} P_t(1, j) s^j \right)^i.$$

We exclude the trivial case where $P_t(i, i) = 1$ for every $t \geq 0$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Then, there exist $a > 0$ and an offspring distribution γ with $\gamma(1) = 0$ such that the generator of Y can be written of the form

$$Q = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ a\gamma(0) & -a & a\gamma(2) & a\gamma(3) & a\gamma(4) & \dots \\ 0 & 2a\gamma(0) & -2a & 2a\gamma(2) & a\gamma(3) & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & 3a\gamma(0) & -3a & 3a\gamma(2) & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \end{pmatrix}.$$

Furthermore, it is well known that Y becomes extinct almost surely if and only if γ is critical or subcritical. We refer the reader to [3] and [14] for more details.

2.2 Deterministic trees

2.2.1 The space $(\mathbb{T}, d_{GH})$ of rooted compact $\mathbb{R}$ -trees

We start with a basic definition.

Definition 2.1 *A metric space $(\mathcal{T}, d)$ is an $\mathbb{R}$ -tree if the following two properties hold for every $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \mathcal{T}$.*

(i) *There is a unique isometric map f_{σ_1, σ_2} from $[0, d(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)]$ into $\mathcal{T}$ such that*

$$f_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2}(0) = \sigma_1 \text{ and } f_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2}(d(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)) = \sigma_2.$$

(ii) *If q is a continuous injective map from $[0, 1]$ into $\mathcal{T}$ such that $q(0) = \sigma_1$ and $q(1) = \sigma_2$, we have*

$$q([0, 1]) = f_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2}([0, d(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)]).$$

A rooted $\mathbb{R}$ -tree is an $\mathbb{R}$ -tree with a distinguished vertex $\rho = \rho(\mathcal{T})$ called the root.

In what follows, $\mathbb{R}$ -trees will always be rooted.

Let $(\mathcal{T}, d)$ be an $\mathbb{R}$ -tree with root ρ , and $\sigma, \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \mathcal{T}$. We write $[[\sigma_1, \sigma_2]]$ for the range of the map f_{σ_1, σ_2} . In particular, $[[\rho, \sigma]]$ is the path going from the root to σ and can be interpreted as the ancestral line of σ .

The height $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T})$ of the $\mathbb{R}$ -tree $\mathcal{T}$ is defined by $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) = \sup\{d(\rho, \sigma) : \sigma \in \mathcal{T}\}$. In particular, if $\mathcal{T}$ is compact, its height $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T})$ is finite.

Two rooted $\mathbb{R}$ -trees $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{T}'$ are called equivalent if there is a root-preserving isometry that maps $\mathcal{T}$ onto $\mathcal{T}'$. We denote by $\mathbb{T}$ the set of all equivalence classes of rooted compact $\mathbb{R}$ -trees. We often abuse notation and identify a rooted compact $\mathbb{R}$ -tree with its equivalence class.

The set $\mathbb{T}$ can be equipped with the pointed Gromov-Hausdorff distance, which is defined as follows. If (E, δ) is a metric space, we use the notation δ_{Haus} for the usual Hausdorff metric between compact subsets of E . Then, if $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{T}'$ are two rooted compact $\mathbb{R}$ -trees with respective roots ρ and ρ' , we define the distance $d_{GH}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}')$ as

$$d_{GH}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}') = \inf \left\{ \delta_{Haus}(\phi(\mathcal{T}), \phi'(\mathcal{T}')) \vee \delta(\phi(\rho), \phi'(\rho')) \right\},$$

where the infimum is over all isometric embeddings $\phi : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow E$ and $\phi' : \mathcal{T}' \rightarrow E$ into a common metric space (E, δ) . We see that $d_{GH}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}')$ only depends on the equivalence classes of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{T}'$. Furthermore, according to Theorem 2 in [8], d_{GH} defines a metric on $\mathbb{T}$ that makes it complete and separable. Notice that $d_{GH}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}')$ makes sense more generally if $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{T}'$ are pointed compact metric spaces (see e.g. Chapter 7 in [4]). We will use this in the proof of Lemma 2.2 below.

We equip $\mathbb{T}$ with its Borel σ -field. If $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$, we set $\mathcal{T}_{\leq t} = \{\sigma \in \mathcal{T} : d(\rho, \sigma) \leq t\}$ for every $t \geq 0$. Plainly, $\mathcal{T}_{\leq t}$ is a real tree whose root is the same as the root of $\mathcal{T}$. Note that the mapping $\mathcal{T} \mapsto \mathcal{T}_{\leq t}$ from $\mathbb{T}$ into $\mathbb{T}$ is Lipschitz for the Gromov-Hausdorff metric.

2.2.2 The $\mathbb{R}$ -tree coded by a function

We now recall a construction of rooted compact $\mathbb{R}$ -trees which is described in [7]. Let $g : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ be a continuous function with compact support satisfying $g(0) = 0$. We exclude the trivial case where g is identically zero. For every $s, t \geq 0$, we set

$$m_g(s, t) = \inf_{r \in [s \wedge t, s \vee t]} g(r)$$

and

$$d_g(s, t) = g(s) + g(t) - 2m_g(s, t).$$

We define an equivalence relation $\sim$ on $[0, +\infty)$ by declaring that $s \sim t$ if and only if $d_g(s, t) = 0$ (or equivalently if and only if $g(s) = g(t) = m_g(s, t)$). Let $\mathcal{T}_g$ be the quotient space

$$\mathcal{T}_g = [0, +\infty) / \sim.$$

Then, d_g induces a metric on $\mathcal{T}_g$ and we keep the notation d_g for this metric. According to Theorem 2.1 of [7], the metric space $(\mathcal{T}_g, d_g)$ is a compact $\mathbb{R}$ -tree. By convention, its root is the equivalence class of 0 for $\sim$ and is denoted by ρ_g .

2.2.3 Subtrees of a tree above a fixed level

Let $(\mathcal{T}, d) \in \mathbb{T}$ and $t > 0$. Denote by $\mathcal{T}^{i, \circ}, i \in I$ the connected components of the open set $\mathcal{T}_{>t} = \{\sigma \in \mathcal{T} : d(\rho(\mathcal{T}), \sigma) > t\}$. Let $i \in I$. Then the ancestor of σ at level t , that is, the unique vertex on the line segment $[[\rho, \sigma]]$ at distance t from ρ , must be the same for all $\sigma \in \mathcal{T}^{i, \circ}$. We denote by σ_i this common ancestor and set $\mathcal{T}^i = \mathcal{T}^{i, \circ} \cup \{\sigma_i\}$. Then $\mathcal{T}^i$

is a compact rooted $\mathbb{R}$ -tree with root σ_i . The trees $\mathcal{T}^i, i \in I$ are called the subtrees of $\mathcal{T}$ above level t . We now consider, for every $h > 0$,

$$Z(t, t+h)(\mathcal{T}) = \#\{i \in I : \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}^i) > h\}.$$

By a compactness argument, we can easily verify that $Z(t, t+h)(\mathcal{T}) < \infty$.

2.2.4 Discrete trees and real trees

We start with some formalism for discrete trees. We first introduce the set of labels

$$U = \bigcup_{n \geq 0} \mathbb{N}^n,$$

where by convention $\mathbb{N}^0 = \{\emptyset\}$. An element of U is a sequence $u = u^1 \dots u^n$, and we set $|u| = n$ so that $|u|$ represents the generation of u . In particular, $|\emptyset| = 0$. If $u = u^1 \dots u^n$ and $v = v^1 \dots v^m$ belong to U , we write $uv = u^1 \dots u^n v^1 \dots v^m$ for the concatenation of u and v . In particular, $\emptyset u = u \emptyset = u$. The mapping $\pi : U \setminus \{\emptyset\} \rightarrow U$ is defined by $\pi(u^1 \dots u^n) = u^1 \dots u^{n-1}$ ($\pi(u)$ is the father of u). Note that $\pi^k(u) = \emptyset$ if $k = |u|$.

A rooted ordered tree θ is a finite subset of U such that

- (i) $\emptyset \in \theta$,
- (ii) $u \in \theta \setminus \{\emptyset\} \implies \pi(u) \in \theta$,
- (iii) for every $u \in \theta$, there exists a number $k_u(\theta) \geq 0$ such that $uj \in \theta$ if and only if $1 \leq j \leq k_u(\theta)$.

We denote by $\mathcal{A}$ the set of all rooted ordered trees. If $\theta \in \mathcal{A}$, we write $\mathcal{H}(\theta)$ for the height of θ , that is $\mathcal{H}(\theta) = \max\{|u| : u \in \theta\}$. And for every $u \in \theta$, we define $\tau_u \theta \in \mathcal{A}$ by $\tau_u \theta = \{v \in U : uv \in \theta\}$. This is the tree θ shifted at u .

Let us define an equivalence relation on $\mathcal{A}$ by setting $\theta \sim \theta'$ if and only if we can find a permutation φ_u of the set $\{1, \dots, k_u(\theta)\}$ for every $u \in \theta$ such that $k_u(\theta) \geq 1$, in such a way that

$$\theta' = \{\emptyset\} \cup \{\varphi_\emptyset(u^1)\varphi_{u^1}(u^2) \dots \varphi_{u^1 \dots u^{n-1}}(u^n) : u^1 \dots u^n \in \theta, n \geq 1\}.$$

In other words $\theta \sim \theta'$ if they correspond to the same unordered tree. Let $\mathbb{A} = \mathcal{A} / \sim$ be the associated quotient space and let $\mathbf{p} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$ be the canonical projection. It is immediate that if $\theta \sim \theta'$, then $k_\emptyset(\theta) = k_\emptyset(\theta')$. So, for every $\xi \in \mathbb{A}$, we may define $k_\emptyset(\xi) = k_\emptyset(\theta)$ where θ is any representative of ξ . Let us fix $\xi \in \mathbb{A}$ such that $k_\emptyset(\xi) = k > 0$ and choose a representative θ of ξ . We can define $\{\xi^1, \dots, \xi^k\} = \{\mathbf{p}(\tau_1 \theta), \dots, \mathbf{p}(\tau_k \theta)\}$ as

the unordered family of subtrees of ξ above the first generation. Then, if $F : \mathcal{A}^k \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is any symmetric measurable function, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & (\#\mathfrak{p}^{-1}(\xi))^{-1} \sum_{\theta \in \mathfrak{p}^{-1}(\xi)} F(\tau_1\theta, \dots, \tau_k\theta) \\ &= (\#\mathfrak{p}^{-1}(\xi^1))^{-1} \dots (\#\mathfrak{p}^{-1}(\xi^k))^{-1} \sum_{\theta_1 \in \mathfrak{p}^{-1}(\xi^1)} \dots \sum_{\theta_k \in \mathfrak{p}^{-1}(\xi^k)} F(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Note that the right-hand side of (3) is well defined since it is symmetric in $\{\xi^1, \dots, \xi^k\}$. The identity (3) is a simple combinatorial fact, whose proof is left to the reader.

A marked tree is a pair $T = (\theta, \{h_u\}_{u \in \theta})$ where $\theta \in \mathcal{A}$ and $h_u \geq 0$ for every $u \in \theta$. We denote by $\mathcal{M}$ the set of all marked trees. We can associate with every marked tree $T = (\theta, \{h_u\}_{u \in \theta}) \in \mathcal{M}$, an $\mathbb{R}$ -tree $\mathcal{T}^T$ in the following way. Let $\mathbb{R}^\theta$ be the vector space of all mappings from θ into $\mathbb{R}$. Write $(e_u, u \in \theta)$ for the canonical basis of $\mathbb{R}^\theta$. We define $l_\emptyset = 0$ and $l_u = \sum_{k=1}^{|u|} h_{\pi^k(u)} e_{\pi^k(u)}$ for $u \in \theta$. Let us set

$$\mathcal{T}^T = \bigcup_{u \in \theta} [l_u, l_u + h_u e_u].$$

$\mathcal{T}^T$ is a connected union of line segments in $\mathbb{R}^\theta$. It is equipped with the distance d_T such that $d_T(a, b)$ is the length of the shortest path in $\mathcal{T}^T$ between a and b , and can be rooted in $\rho(\mathcal{T}^T) = 0$ so that it becomes a rooted compact $\mathbb{R}$ -tree.

If $\theta \in \mathcal{A}$, we write $\mathcal{T}^\theta$ for the $\mathbb{R}$ -tree $\mathcal{T}^T$ where $T = (\theta, \{h_u\}_{u \in \theta})$ with $h_\emptyset = 0$ and $h_u = 1$ for every $u \in \theta \setminus \{\emptyset\}$, and we write d_θ for the associated distance. We then set $m_\emptyset = 0$ and $m_u = \sum_{k=0}^{|u|-1} e_{\pi^k(u)} = l_u + e_u$ for every $u \in \theta \setminus \{\emptyset\}$.

It is easily checked that $\mathcal{T}^\theta = \mathcal{T}^{\theta'}$ if $\theta \sim \theta'$. Thus for every $\xi \in \mathbb{A}$, we may write $\mathcal{T}^\xi$ for the tree $\mathcal{T}^\theta$ where θ is any representative of ξ .

We will now explain how to approximate a general tree $\mathcal{T}$ in $\mathbb{T}$ by a discrete type tree. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and set $\mathbb{T}^{(\varepsilon)} = \{\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T} : \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) > \varepsilon\}$. For every $\mathcal{T}$ in $\mathbb{T}^{(\varepsilon)}$, we can construct by induction an element $\xi^\varepsilon(\mathcal{T})$ of $\mathbb{A}$ in the following way:

- If $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}^{(\varepsilon)}$ satisfies $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) \leq 2\varepsilon$, we set $\xi^\varepsilon(\mathcal{T}) = \mathfrak{p}(\{\emptyset\})$.
- Let n be a positive integer. Assume that we have defined $\xi^\varepsilon(\mathcal{T})$ for every $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}^{(\varepsilon)}$ such that $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) \leq (n+1)\varepsilon$. Let $\mathcal{T}$ be an $\mathbb{R}$ -tree such that $(n+1)\varepsilon < \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) \leq (n+2)\varepsilon$. We set $k = Z(\varepsilon, 2\varepsilon)(\mathcal{T})$ and we denote by $\mathcal{T}^1, \dots, \mathcal{T}^k$ the k subtrees of $\mathcal{T}$ above level ε with height greater than ε . Then $\varepsilon < \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}^i) \leq (n+1)\varepsilon$ for every $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, so we can define $\xi^\varepsilon(\mathcal{T}^i)$. Let us choose a representative θ^i of $\xi^\varepsilon(\mathcal{T}^i)$ for every $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. We set

$$\xi^\varepsilon(\mathcal{T}) = \mathfrak{p}(\{\emptyset\} \cup 1\theta^1 \cup \dots \cup k\theta^k),$$

where $i\theta^i = \{iu : u \in \theta^i\}$. Clearly this does not depend on the choice of the representatives θ_i .

If $r > 0$ and $\mathcal{T}$ is a compact rooted $\mathbb{R}$ -tree with metric d , we write $r\mathcal{T}$ for the same tree equipped with the metric rd .

Lemma 2.2 *For every $\varepsilon > 0$ and every $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}^{(\varepsilon)}$, we have*

$$d_{GH}(\varepsilon\mathcal{T}^{\xi^\varepsilon(\mathcal{T})}, \mathcal{T}) \leq 4\varepsilon. \quad (4)$$

PROOF: Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$. Let θ be any representative of $\xi^\varepsilon(\mathcal{T})$. Recall the notation $(m_u, u \in \theta)$. We can construct a mapping $\phi : \theta \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ such that:

- (i) For every $\sigma \in \mathcal{T}$, there exists $u \in \theta$ such that $d(\sigma, \phi(u)) \leq 2\varepsilon$,
- (ii) for every $u \in \theta$, $d(\phi(u), \rho) = \varepsilon|u|$ where ρ denotes the root of $\mathcal{T}$,
- (iii) for every $u, u' \in \theta$, $0 \leq \varepsilon d_\theta(m_u, m_{u'}) - d(\phi(u), \phi(u')) \leq 2\varepsilon$.

To be specific, we always take $\phi(\emptyset) = \rho$, which suffices for the construction if $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) \leq 2\varepsilon$. If $(n+1)\varepsilon < \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) \leq (n+2)\varepsilon$ for some $n \geq 1$, we have as above

$$\theta = \{\emptyset\} \cup 1\theta^1 \cup \dots \cup k\theta^k,$$

where $\theta^1, \dots, \theta^k$ are representatives of respectively $\xi^\varepsilon(\mathcal{T}^1), \dots, \xi^\varepsilon(\mathcal{T}^k)$, if $\mathcal{T}^1, \dots, \mathcal{T}^k$ are the subtrees of $\mathcal{T}$ above level ε with height greater than ε . With an obvious notation we define $\phi(ju) = \phi_j(u)$ for every $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ and $u \in \theta^j$. Properties (i)-(iii) are then easily checked by induction.

Let us now set $\Phi = \{\phi(u), u \in \theta\}$ and $M = \{m_u, u \in \theta\}$. We equip Φ with the metric induced by d and M with the metric induced by εd_θ . Then, Φ and M can be viewed as pointed compact metric spaces with respective roots ρ and 0 . It is immediate that $d_{GH}(\varepsilon\mathcal{T}^\theta, M) \leq \varepsilon$. Furthermore, Property (i) above implies that $d_{GH}(\mathcal{T}, \Phi) \leq 2\varepsilon$. At last, according to Lemma 2.3 in [8] and Property (iii) above, we have $d_{GH}(\Phi, M) \leq \varepsilon$. Lemma 2.2 then follows from the triangle inequality for d_{GH} . $\square$

2.3 Lévy trees

Roughly speaking, a Lévy tree is a $\mathbb{T}$ -valued random variable which is associated with a CSBP in such a way that it describes the genealogy of a population evolving according to this CSBP.

2.3.1 The measure Θ_ψ

We consider on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathbf{P})$ a ψ -CSBP $Y = (Y_t, t \geq 0)$, where the function ψ is of the form (1), and we suppose that Y becomes extinct almost surely. This condition is equivalent to

$$\int_1^\infty \frac{du}{\psi(u)} < \infty. \quad (5)$$

This implies that at least one of the following two conditions holds:

$$\beta > 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \int_{(0,1)} r\pi(dr) = \infty. \quad (6)$$

The Lévy tree associated to Y will be defined as the tree coded by the so-called height process, which is a functional of the Lévy process with Laplace exponent ψ . Let us denote by $X = (X_t, t \geq 0)$ a Lévy process on $(\Omega, \mathbf{P})$ with Laplace exponent ψ . This means that X is a Lévy process with no negative jumps, and that for every $\lambda, t \geq 0$,

$$\mathbf{E}(\exp(-\lambda X_t)) = \exp(t\psi(\lambda)).$$

Then, X does not drift to $+\infty$ and has paths of infinite variation (by (6)).

We can define the height process $H = (H_t, t \geq 0)$ by the following approximation:

$$H_t = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_0^t \mathbb{1}_{\{X_s \leq I_t^s + \varepsilon\}} ds,$$

where $I_t^s = \inf\{X_r : s \leq r \leq t\}$ and the convergence holds in probability (see Chapter 1 in [6]). Informally, we can say that H measures the size of the set $\{s \in [0, t] : X_{s-} \leq I_t^s\}$. Thanks to condition (5), we know that the process H has a continuous modification (see Theorem 4.7 in [6]). From now on, we consider only this modification.

Let us now set $I_t = \inf\{X_s : 0 \leq s \leq t\}$ for every $t \geq 0$, and consider the process $X - I = (X_t - I_t, t \geq 0)$. We recall that $X - I$ is a strong Markov process, for which the point 0 is regular. The process $-I$ is a local time for $X - I$ at level 0. We write N for the associated excursion measure. We let $\Delta(de)$ be the "law" of $(H_s, s \geq 0)$ under N . This makes sense because the values of the height process in an excursion of $X - I$ away from 0 only depend on that excursion (see section 1.2 in [6]). Then, $\Delta(de)$ is a σ -finite measure on $C([0, \infty))$, and is supported on functions with compact support such that $e(0) = 0$.

The Lévy tree is the tree $(\mathcal{T}_e, d_e)$ coded by the function e , in the sense of section 2.2.2, under the measure $\Delta(de)$. We denote by Θ_ψ the σ -finite measure on $\mathbb{T}$ which is the "law" of the Lévy tree, that is the image of $\Delta(de)$ under the mapping $e \mapsto \mathcal{T}_e$.

2.3.2 A discrete approximation of the Lévy tree

Let us now recall that the Lévy tree is the limit in the Gromov-Hausdorff distance of suitably rescaled Galton-Watson trees.

We start by recalling the definition of Galton-Watson trees which was given informally in the introduction above. Let γ be a critical or subcritical offspring distribution. We exclude the trivial case where $\gamma(1) = 1$. Then, there exists a unique probability measure Π_γ on $\mathcal{A}$ such that:

- (i) For every $p \geq 0$, $\Pi_\gamma(k_\emptyset = p) = \gamma(p)$,

- (ii) for every $p \geq 1$ with $\gamma(p) > 0$, under the probability measure $\Pi_\gamma(\cdot \mid k_\emptyset = p)$, the shifted trees $\tau_1\theta, \dots, \tau_p\theta$ are independent and distributed according to Π_γ .

Recall that if $r > 0$ and $\mathcal{T}$ is a compact rooted $\mathbb{R}$ -tree with metric d , we write $r\mathcal{T}$ for the same tree equipped with the metric rd . The following result is Theorem 4.1 in [7].

Theorem 2.3 *Let $(\gamma_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of critical or subcritical offspring distributions. For every $n \geq 1$, let us denote by X^n a Galton-Watson process with offspring distribution γ_n , started at $X_0^n = n$. Let $(m_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a nondecreasing sequence of positive integers converging to infinity. We define a sequence of processes $(Y^n)_{n \geq 1}$ by setting, for every $t \geq 0$ and $n \geq 1$,*

$$Y_t^n = n^{-1} X_{[m_n t]}^n.$$

Assume that, for every $t \geq 0$, $(Y_t^n)_{n \geq 1}$ converges in distribution to Y_t where $Y = (Y_t, t \geq 0)$ is a ψ -CSBP which becomes extinct almost surely. Assume furthermore that for every $\delta > 0$,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(Y_\delta^n = 0) > 0.$$

Then, for every $a > 0$, the law of the $\mathbb{R}$ -tree $m_n^{-1}\mathcal{T}^\theta$ under $\Pi_{\gamma_n}(\cdot \mid \mathcal{H}(\theta) \geq [am_n])$ converges as $n \rightarrow \infty$ to the probability measure $\Theta_\psi(\cdot \mid \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) > a)$ in the sense of weak convergence of measures in the space $\mathbb{T}$.

3 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Let Θ be an infinite measure on $(\mathbb{T}, d_{GH})$ satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 1.1. Clearly Θ is σ -finite.

We start with two important lemmas that will be used throughout this section. Let us first define $v : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ by $v(t) = \Theta(\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) > t)$ for every $t > 0$. For every $t > 0$, we denote by Θ^t the probability measure $\Theta(\cdot \mid \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) > t)$.

Lemma 3.1 *The function v is nonincreasing, continuous and verifies*

$$v(t) \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow 0]{} \infty \quad \text{and} \quad v(t) \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow \infty]{} 0.$$

PROOF: We only have to prove the continuity of v . To this end, we argue by contradiction and assume that there exists $t > 0$ such that $\Theta(\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) = t) > 0$. Let $s > 0$ and $u \in (0, t)$ such that $v(u) > v(t)$. From the regenerative property (R), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta^s(\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) = s + t) &= \Theta^s(\Theta^s(\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) = s + t \mid Z(s, s + u))) \\ &= \Theta^s\left(Z(s, s + u)\Theta^u(\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) = t)(\Theta^u(\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) \leq t))^{Z(s, s + u) - 1}\right) \\ &= \frac{\Theta(\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) = t)}{v(u)} \Theta^s\left(Z(s, s + u)\left(1 - \frac{v(t)}{v(u)}\right)^{Z(s, s + u) - 1}\right) \\ &> 0. \end{aligned}$$

We have shown that $\Theta(\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) = t + s) > 0$ for every $s > 0$. This is absurd since Θ is σ -finite. $\square$

Lemma 3.2 *For every $t > 0$ and $0 < a < b$, the conditional law of the random variable $Z(t, t+b)$, under the probability measure Θ^t and given $Z(t, t+a)$, is a binomial distribution with parameters $Z(t, t+a)$ and $v(b)/v(a)$ (where we define the binomial distribution with parameters 0 and $p \in [0, 1]$ as the Dirac measure δ_0).*

PROOF: This is a straightforward consequence of the regenerative property. $\square$

3.1 The CSBP derived from Θ

In this section, we consider a random forest of trees derived from a Poisson point measure with intensity Θ . We associate with this forest a family of Galton-Watson processes. We then construct local times at every level $a > 0$ as limits of the rescaled Galton-Watson processes. Finally we show that the local time process is a CSBP.

Let us now fix the framework. We consider a probability space $(\Omega, \mathbb{P})$ and on this space a Poisson point measure $\mathcal{N} = \sum_{i \in I} \delta_{\mathcal{T}_i}$ on $\mathbb{T}$, whose intensity is the measure Θ .

3.1.1 A family of Galton-Watson trees

We start with some notation that we need in the first lemma. We consider on another probability space $(\Omega', \mathbb{P}')$, a collection $(\theta_\xi, \xi \in \mathbb{A})$ of independent $\mathcal{A}$ -valued random variables such that for every $\xi \in \mathbb{A}$, θ_ξ is distributed uniformly over $\mathfrak{p}^{-1}(\xi)$. In what follows, to simplify notation, we identify an element ξ of the set $\mathbb{A}$ with the subset $\mathfrak{p}^{-1}(\xi)$ of $\mathcal{A}$. Recall the definition of $\xi^\varepsilon(\mathcal{T})$ before Lemma 2.2.

Lemma 3.3 *Let us define for every $\varepsilon > 0$, a mapping $\theta^{(\varepsilon)}$ from $\mathbb{T}^{(\varepsilon)} \times \Omega'$ into $\mathcal{A}$ by*

$$\theta^{(\varepsilon)}(\mathcal{T}, \omega) = \theta_{\xi^\varepsilon(\mathcal{T})}(\omega).$$

Then for every positive integer p , the law of the random variable $\theta^{(\varepsilon)}$ under the probability measure $\Theta^{p\varepsilon} \otimes \mathbb{P}'$ is $\Pi_{\mu_\varepsilon}(\cdot \mid \mathcal{H}(\theta) \geq p - 1)$ where μ_ε denotes the law of $Z(\varepsilon, 2\varepsilon)$ under Θ^ε .

PROOF: Since $\{\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) > p\varepsilon\} \times \Omega' = \{\mathcal{H}(\theta^{(\varepsilon)}) \geq p - 1\}$ for every $p \geq 1$, it suffices to show the result for $p = 1$. Let k be a nonnegative integer. According to the construction of $\xi^\varepsilon(\mathcal{T})$, we have

$$\Theta^\varepsilon \otimes \mathbb{P}'(k_\emptyset(\theta^{(\varepsilon)}) = k) = \Theta^\varepsilon(Z(\varepsilon, 2\varepsilon) = k) = \mu_\varepsilon(k).$$

Let us fix $k \geq 1$ with $\mu_\varepsilon(k) > 0$. Let $F : \mathcal{A}^k \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be a symmetric measurable function. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Theta^\varepsilon \otimes \mathbb{P}' \left(F(\tau_1 \theta^{(\varepsilon)}, \dots, \tau_k \theta^{(\varepsilon)}) \mid k_\emptyset(\theta^{(\varepsilon)}) = k \right) \\
&= \Theta^\varepsilon \otimes \mathbb{P}' \left(\sum_{\theta \in \xi^\varepsilon(\mathcal{T})} F(\tau_1 \theta, \dots, \tau_k \theta) \mathbb{1}_{\{\theta_{\xi^\varepsilon(\mathcal{T})} = \theta\}} \mid Z(\varepsilon, 2\varepsilon) = k \right) \\
&= \Theta^\varepsilon \left((\#\xi^\varepsilon(\mathcal{T}))^{-1} \sum_{\theta \in \xi^\varepsilon(\mathcal{T})} F(\tau_1 \theta, \dots, \tau_k \theta) \mid Z(\varepsilon, 2\varepsilon) = k \right). \tag{7}
\end{aligned}$$

On the event $\{Z(\varepsilon, 2\varepsilon) = k\}$, we write $\mathcal{T}^1, \dots, \mathcal{T}^k$ for the k subtrees of $\mathcal{T}$ above level ε with height greater than ε . Then, Formula (3) and the regenerative property yield

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Theta^\varepsilon \left((\#\xi^\varepsilon(\mathcal{T}))^{-1} \sum_{\theta \in \xi^\varepsilon(\mathcal{T})} F(\tau_1 \theta, \dots, \tau_k \theta) \mid Z(\varepsilon, 2\varepsilon) = k \right) \\
&= \Theta^\varepsilon \left((\#\xi^\varepsilon(\mathcal{T}^1))^{-1} \dots (\#\xi^\varepsilon(\mathcal{T}^k))^{-1} \sum_{\theta_1 \in \xi^\varepsilon(\mathcal{T}^1)} \dots \sum_{\theta_k \in \xi^\varepsilon(\mathcal{T}^k)} F(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k) \mid Z(\varepsilon, 2\varepsilon) = k \right) \\
&= \int \Theta^\varepsilon(d\mathcal{T}_1) \dots \Theta^\varepsilon(d\mathcal{T}_k) (\#\xi^\varepsilon(\mathcal{T}_1))^{-1} \dots (\#\xi^\varepsilon(\mathcal{T}_k))^{-1} \sum_{\theta_1 \in \xi^\varepsilon(\mathcal{T}_1)} \dots \sum_{\theta_k \in \xi^\varepsilon(\mathcal{T}_k)} F(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k) \\
&= \int \Theta^\varepsilon \otimes \mathbb{P}'(d\mathcal{T}_1, d\omega'_1) \dots \Theta^\varepsilon \otimes \mathbb{P}'(d\mathcal{T}_k, d\omega'_k) F(\theta^{(\varepsilon)}(\mathcal{T}_1, \omega'_1), \dots, \theta^{(\varepsilon)}(\mathcal{T}_k, \omega'_k)),
\end{aligned}$$

as in (7). We have thus proved that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Theta^\varepsilon \otimes \mathbb{P}' \left(F(\tau_1 \theta^{(\varepsilon)}, \dots, \tau_k \theta^{(\varepsilon)}) \mid k_\emptyset(\theta^{(\varepsilon)}) = k \right) \\
&= \int \Theta^\varepsilon \otimes \mathbb{P}'(d\mathcal{T}_1, d\omega'_1) \dots \Theta^\varepsilon \otimes \mathbb{P}'(d\mathcal{T}_k, d\omega'_k) F(\theta^{(\varepsilon)}(\mathcal{T}_1, \omega'_1), \dots, \theta^{(\varepsilon)}(\mathcal{T}_k, \omega'_k)). \tag{8}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that for every permutation φ of the set $\{1, \dots, k\}$, $(\tau_{\varphi(1)} \theta^{(\varepsilon)}, \dots, \tau_{\varphi(k)} \theta^{(\varepsilon)})$ and $(\tau_1 \theta^{(\varepsilon)}, \dots, \tau_k \theta^{(\varepsilon)})$ have the same distribution under $\Theta^\varepsilon \otimes \mathbb{P}'$. Then, (8) means that the law of $\theta^{(\varepsilon)}$ under $\Theta^\varepsilon \otimes \mathbb{P}'$ satisfies the branching property of the Galton-Watson trees. This completes the proof of the desired result. $\square$

Recall that $\sum_{i \in I} \delta_{\mathcal{T}_i}$ is a Poisson point measure on $\mathbb{T}$ with intensity Θ . Let us now set, for every $t, h > 0$,

$$\mathcal{Z}(t, t+h) = \sum_{i \in I} Z(t, t+h)(\mathcal{T}_i).$$

For every $\varepsilon > 0$, we define a process $\mathcal{X}^\varepsilon = (\mathcal{X}_k^\varepsilon, k \geq 0)$ on $(\Omega, \mathbb{P})$ by the formula

$$\mathcal{X}_k^\varepsilon = \mathcal{Z}(k\varepsilon, (k+1)\varepsilon), \quad k \geq 0.$$

Proposition 3.4 *For every $\varepsilon > 0$, the process $\mathcal{X}^\varepsilon$ is a Galton-Watson process whose initial distribution is the Poisson distribution with parameter $v(\varepsilon)$ and whose offspring distribution is μ_ε .*

PROOF: We first observe that $\mathcal{X}_0^\varepsilon = \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) > \varepsilon)$ is Poisson with parameter $\Theta(\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) > \varepsilon) = v(\varepsilon)$. Then let p be a positive integer. We know from a classical property of Poisson measures that, under the probability measure $\mathbb{P}$ and conditionally on the event $\{\mathcal{X}_0^\varepsilon = p\}$, the atoms of $\mathcal{N}$ that belong to the set $\mathbb{T}^\varepsilon$ are distributed as p i.i.d. variables with distribution Θ^ε . Furthermore, it follows from Lemma 3.3 that under Θ^ε , the process $(Z(k\varepsilon, (k+1)\varepsilon))_{k \geq 0}$ is a Galton-Watson process started at one with offspring distribution μ_ε . This completes the proof. $\square$

As a consequence, we get the next proposition, which we will use throughout this work.

Proposition 3.5 *For every $t > 0$ and $h > 0$, we have $\Theta(Z(t, t+h)) \leq v(h)$.*

PROOF: Since compact real trees have finite height, the Galton-Watson process $\mathcal{X}^\varepsilon$ dies out $\mathbb{P}$ a.s. This implies that μ_ε is critical or subcritical so that $(\mathcal{X}_k^\varepsilon, k \geq 0)$ is a supermartingale. Let $t, h > 0$. We can find $\varepsilon > 0$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $t = k\varepsilon$ and $\varepsilon \leq h$. Thus we have,

$$\Theta(Z(t, t+\varepsilon)) = \Theta(Z(k\varepsilon, (k+1)\varepsilon)) = \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{X}_k^\varepsilon) \leq \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{X}_0^\varepsilon) = v(\varepsilon). \quad (9)$$

Using Lemma 3.2 and (9), we get

$$\Theta(Z(t, t+h)) = \Theta\left(Z(t, t+\varepsilon) \frac{v(h)}{v(\varepsilon)}\right) \leq v(h).$$

$\square$

3.1.2 A local time process

Proposition 3.6 *For every $t \geq 0$, there exists a random variable L_t on the space $\mathbb{T}$ such that Θ a.e.,*

$$\frac{Z(t, t+h)}{v(h)} \xrightarrow{h \rightarrow 0} L_t.$$

PROOF: Let us start with the case $t = 0$. As $Z(0, h) = \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) > h\}}$ for every $h > 0$, Lemma 3.1 gives $v(h)^{-1}Z(0, h) \rightarrow 0$ Θ a.e. as $h \rightarrow 0$, so we set $L_0 = 0$.

Let us now fix $t > 0$. Thanks to Lemma 3.1, we can define a decreasing sequence $(\varepsilon_n)_{n \geq 1}$ by the condition $v(\varepsilon_n) = n^4$ for every $n \geq 1$. We claim that there exists a random variable L_t on the space $\mathbb{T}$ such that, Θ a.e.,

$$\frac{Z(t, t+\varepsilon_n)}{n^4} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} L_t. \quad (10)$$

Indeed, using Lemma 3.2, we have, for every $n \geq 1$,

$$\Theta^t \left(\left| \frac{Z(t, t+\varepsilon_n)}{n^4} - \frac{Z(t, t+\varepsilon_{n+1})}{(n+1)^4} \right|^2 \right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \Theta^t \left(\frac{1}{n^8} \Theta^t \left(\left| Z(t, t + \varepsilon_n) - \frac{n^4}{(n+1)^4} Z(t, t + \varepsilon_{n+1}) \right|^2 \middle| Z(t, t + \varepsilon_{n+1}) \right) \right) \\
&\leq \Theta^t \left(\frac{Z(t, t + \varepsilon_{n+1})}{4n^8} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{(n+1)^4}{4v(t)n^8},
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where the last bound follows from Proposition 3.5 and the definition of ε_{n+1} . Thanks to the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we get

$$\Theta^t \left(\left| \frac{Z(t, t + \varepsilon_n)}{n^4} - \frac{Z(t, t + \varepsilon_{n+1})}{(n+1)^4} \right| \right) \leq \frac{(n+1)^2}{2n^4 \sqrt{v(t)}} \leq \frac{2}{n^2 \sqrt{v(t)}}. \tag{12}$$

The bound (12) implies

$$\Theta \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left| \frac{Z(t, t + \varepsilon_n)}{n^4} - \frac{Z(t, t + \varepsilon_{n+1})}{(n+1)^4} \right| \right) < \infty.$$

In particular, Θ a.e.,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left| \frac{Z(t, t + \varepsilon_n)}{n^4} - \frac{Z(t, t + \varepsilon_{n+1})}{(n+1)^4} \right| < \infty.$$

Our claim (10) follows.

For every $h \in (0, \varepsilon_1]$, we can find $n \geq 1$ such that $\varepsilon_{n+1} \leq h \leq \varepsilon_n$. Then, we have $Z(t, t + \varepsilon_n) \leq Z(t, t + h) \leq Z(t, t + \varepsilon_{n+1})$ Θ a.e., and $n^4 \leq v(h) \leq (n+1)^4$ so that

$$\frac{Z(t, t + \varepsilon_n)}{(n+1)^4} \leq \frac{Z(t, t + h)}{v(h)} \leq \frac{Z(t, t + \varepsilon_{n+1})}{n^4}.$$

We then deduce from (10) that Θ a.e.,

$$\frac{Z(t, t + h)}{v(h)} \xrightarrow{h \rightarrow 0} L_t$$

which completes the proof. $\square$

Definition 3.1 We define a process $l = (l_t, t \geq 0)$ on $(\Omega, \mathbb{P})$ by setting $l_0 = 1$ and for every $t > 0$,

$$l_t = \sum_{i \in I} L_t(\mathcal{T}_i).$$

Notice that $L_t(\mathcal{T}) = 0$ if $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) \leq t$ so that the above sum is finite a.s.

Corollary 3.7 *For every $t \geq 0$, we have $\mathbb{P}$ a.s.*

$$\frac{\mathcal{Z}(t, t+h)}{v(h)} \xrightarrow{h \rightarrow 0} l_t.$$

Moreover, this convergence holds in $L^1(\mathbb{P})$ uniformly in $t \in [0, \infty)$.

PROOF: The first assertion is an immediate consequence of Proposition 3.6. Let us focus on the second assertion. From Lemma 3.2, $\Theta(n^{-4}Z(t, t+\varepsilon_n) - (n+1)^{-4}Z(t, t+\varepsilon_{n+1})) = 0$ for every $t \geq 0$ and $n \geq 1$. Thus, from the second moment formula for Poisson measures, we get, for every $t \geq 0$ and $n \geq 1$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\left(\frac{\mathcal{Z}(t, t+\varepsilon_n)}{n^4} - \frac{\mathcal{Z}(t, t+\varepsilon_{n+1})}{(n+1)^4} \right)^2 \right) = \Theta \left(\left(\frac{Z(t, t+\varepsilon_n)}{n^4} - \frac{Z(t, t+\varepsilon_{n+1})}{(n+1)^4} \right)^2 \right).$$

Now, we have

$$\Theta \left(\left(\frac{Z(0, \varepsilon_n)}{n^4} - \frac{Z(0, \varepsilon_{n+1})}{(n+1)^4} \right)^2 \right) = \Theta \left(\left(\frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) > \varepsilon_n\}}}{n^4} - \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) > \varepsilon_{n+1}\}}}{(n+1)^4} \right)^2 \right) = \frac{1}{n^4} - \frac{1}{(n+1)^4}$$

and for every $t > 0$, thanks to the bound (11),

$$\Theta \left(\left(\frac{Z(t, t+\varepsilon_n)}{n^4} - \frac{Z(t, t+\varepsilon_{n+1})}{(n+1)^4} \right)^2 \right) \leq \frac{(n+1)^4}{4n^8}.$$

So for every $t \geq 0$ and $n \geq 1$, we have from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\left| \frac{\mathcal{Z}(t, t+\varepsilon_n)}{n^4} - \frac{\mathcal{Z}(t, t+\varepsilon_{n+1})}{(n+1)^4} \right| \right) \leq \frac{(n+1)^2}{n^4}. \quad (13)$$

Then $n^{-4}\mathcal{Z}(t, t+\varepsilon_n) \rightarrow l_t$ in L^1 as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and, for every $n \geq 2$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\left| \frac{\mathcal{Z}(t, t+\varepsilon_n)}{n^4} - l_t \right| \right) \leq \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \frac{(k+1)^2}{k^4} \leq \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \frac{4}{k^2} \leq \frac{8}{n}.$$

In the same way as in the proof of (13), we have the following inequality: If $h \in (0, \varepsilon_1]$, $t \geq 0$ and n is a positive integer such that $\varepsilon_{n+1} \leq h \leq \varepsilon_n$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\left| \frac{\mathcal{Z}(t, t+\varepsilon_n)}{n^4} - \frac{\mathcal{Z}(t, t+h)}{v(h)} \right| \right) \leq \frac{\sqrt{v(h)}}{n^4} \leq \frac{16}{\sqrt{v(h)}}.$$

Then, for every $h \in (0, \varepsilon_2]$ and $t \geq 0$, we get

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\left| \frac{\mathcal{Z}(t, t+h)}{v(h)} - l_t \right| \right) \leq 16 (v(h)^{-1/2} + v(h)^{-1/4}),$$

which completes the proof. $\square$

We will now establish a regularity property of the process $(l_t, t \geq 0)$.

Proposition 3.8 *The process $(l_t, t \geq 0)$ admits a modification, denoted by $(\tilde{l}_t, t \geq 0)$, which is right-continuous with left-limits, and which has no fixed discontinuities.*

PROOF: We start with two lemmas.

Lemma 3.9 *There exists $\lambda \geq 0$ such that $\mathbb{E}(l_t) = e^{-\lambda t}$ for every $t \geq 0$.*

PROOF: We claim that the function $t \in [0, +\infty) \mapsto \mathbb{E}(l_t)$ is multiplicative, meaning that for every $t, s \geq 0$, $\mathbb{E}(l_{t+s}) = \mathbb{E}(l_t)\mathbb{E}(l_s)$. As $l_0 = 1$ by definition, $\mathbb{E}(l_0) = 1$. Let $t, s > 0$ and $0 < h < s$. Let us denote by $\mathcal{T}^1, \dots, \mathcal{T}^{Z(t, t+h)}$ the subtrees of $\mathcal{T}$ above level t with height greater than h . Then, using the regenerative property, we can write

$$\Theta(Z(t+s, t+s+h)) = \Theta\left(\sum_{i=1}^{Z(t, t+h)} Z(s, s+h)(\mathcal{T}^i)\right) = \Theta(Z(t, t+h))\Theta^h(Z(s, s+h)),$$

which implies

$$\mathbb{E}(Z(t+s, t+s+h)) = \mathbb{E}(Z(t, t+h))\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{Z(s, s+h)}{v(h)}\right). \quad (14)$$

Thus, dividing by $v(h)$ and letting $h \rightarrow 0$ in (14), we get our claim from Corollary 3.7. Moreover, thanks to Proposition 3.5 and Corollary 3.7, we know that $\mathbb{E}(l_t) \leq 1$ for every $t \geq 0$. Then, we obtain in particular that the function $t \in [0, \infty) \mapsto \mathbb{E}(l_t)$ is nonincreasing.

To complete the proof, we have to check that $\mathbb{E}(l_t) > 0$ for every $t > 0$. If we assume that $\mathbb{E}(l_t) = 0$ for some $t > 0$ then $L_t = 0$, Θ a.e. Let $s, h > 0$ such that $0 < h < s$. With the same notation as in the beginning of the proof, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta(\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) > t+s) &= \Theta(\exists i \in \{1, \dots, Z(t, t+h)\} : \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}^i) > s) \\ &= \Theta\left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{v(s)}{v(h)}\right)^{Z(t, t+h)}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Now, thanks to Proposition 3.6, Θ a.e.,

$$\left(1 - \frac{v(s)}{v(h)}\right)^{Z(t, t+h)} \xrightarrow{h \rightarrow 0} \exp(-L_t v(s)) = 1.$$

Moreover, Θ a.e.,

$$1 - \left(1 - \frac{v(s)}{v(h)}\right)^{Z(t, t+h)} \leq \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) > t\}}.$$

Then, using dominated convergence in (15) as $h \rightarrow 0$, we obtain $\Theta(\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) > t+s) = 0$ which contradicts the assumptions of Theorem 1.1. $\square$

Lemma 3.10 *Let us denote by $D = \{k2^{-n}, k \geq 1, n \geq 0\}$ the set of positive dyadic numbers and define $\mathcal{G}_t = \sigma(l_s, s \in D, s \leq t)$ for every $t \in D$. Then $(l_t, t \in D)$ is a nonnegative supermartingale with respect to the filtration $(\mathcal{G}_t, t \in D)$.*

PROOF: Let p be a positive integer, let $s_1, \dots, s_p, s, t \in D$ such that $s_1 < \dots < s_p \leq s < t$ and let $f : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be a bounded continuous function. We can find a positive integer n such that 2^nt , 2^ns , and 2^ns_i for $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ are nonnegative integers. The process $\mathcal{X}^{2^{-n}}$ is a subcritical Galton-Watson process, so

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{X}_{2^nt}^{2^{-n}} f(\mathcal{X}_{2^ns_1}^{2^{-n}}, \dots, \mathcal{X}_{2^ns_p}^{2^{-n}})) \leq \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{X}_{2^ns}^{2^{-n}} f(\mathcal{X}_{2^ns_1}^{2^{-n}}, \dots, \mathcal{X}_{2^ns_p}^{2^{-n}})).$$

Therefore we have also,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\mathcal{Z}(t, t + 2^{-n})}{v(2^{-n})} f \left(\frac{\mathcal{Z}(s_1, s_1 + 2^{-n})}{v(2^{-n})}, \dots, \frac{\mathcal{Z}(s_p, s_p + 2^{-n})}{v(2^{-n})} \right) \right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\mathcal{Z}(s, s + 2^{-n})}{v(2^{-n})} f \left(\frac{\mathcal{Z}(s_1, s_1 + 2^{-n})}{v(2^{-n})}, \dots, \frac{\mathcal{Z}(s_p, s_p + 2^{-n})}{v(2^{-n})} \right) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

We can then use Corollary 3.7 to obtain $\mathbb{E}(l_t f(l_{s_1}, \dots, l_{s_p})) \leq \mathbb{E}(l_s f(l_{s_1}, \dots, l_{s_p}))$. $\square$

We now complete the proof of Proposition 3.8. Let us set, for every $t \geq 0$,

$$\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t = \bigcap_{s > t, s \in D} \mathcal{G}_s.$$

From Lemma 3.10 and classical results on supermartingales, we can define a right-continuous supermartingale $(\tilde{l}_t, t \geq 0)$ with respect to the filtration $(\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t, t \geq 0)$ by setting, for every $t \geq 0$,

$$\tilde{l}_t = \lim_{s \downarrow t, s \in D} l_s, \quad (17)$$

where the limit holds $\mathbb{P}$ a.s. and in $\mathbb{L}^1$ (see e.g. Chapter VI in [5] for more details). We claim that $(\tilde{l}_t, t \geq 0)$ is a càdlàg modification of $(l_t, t \geq 0)$ with no fixed discontinuities.

We first prove that $(\tilde{l}_t, t \geq 0)$ is a modification of $(l_t, t \geq 0)$. For every $t \geq 0$ and every sequence $(s_n)_{n \geq 0}$ in D such that $s_n \downarrow t$ as $n \uparrow \infty$, we have thanks to (17) and Lemma 3.9,

$$\mathbb{E}(\tilde{l}_t) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(l_{s_n}) = \mathbb{E}(l_t).$$

Let us now show that for every $t \geq 0$, $l_t \leq \tilde{l}_t$ $\mathbb{P}$ a.s. Let $\alpha, \varepsilon > 0$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Thanks to Corollary 3.7, we can find $h_0 > 0$ such that for every $h \in (0, h_0)$ and $n \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\left| \frac{\mathcal{Z}(t, t + h)}{v(h)} - l_t \right| \right) \leq \varepsilon \alpha \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E} \left(\left| \frac{\mathcal{Z}(s_n, s_n + h)}{v(h)} - l_{s_n} \right| \right) \leq \varepsilon \alpha.$$

We choose $h \in (0, h_0)$ and $n_0 \geq 0$ such that $s_n - t + h \leq h_0$ and $v(h) \leq (1 + \delta)v(s_n - t + h)$ for every $n \geq n_0$. We notice that $\mathcal{Z}(t, s_n + h) \leq \mathcal{Z}(s_n, s_n + h)$ so that, for every $n \geq n_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(l_t > (1 + \delta)l_{s_n} + \varepsilon) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}\left(l_t - \frac{\mathcal{Z}(t, s_n + h)}{v(s_n - t + h)} > (1 + \delta)l_{s_n} - (1 + \delta)\frac{\mathcal{Z}(s_n, s_n + h)}{v(h)} + \varepsilon\right) \\ & \leq 2\varepsilon^{-1}\mathbb{E}\left(\left|\frac{\mathcal{Z}(t, s_n + h)}{v(s_n - t + h)} - l_t\right|\right) + 2\varepsilon^{-1}(1 + \delta)\mathbb{E}\left(\left|\frac{\mathcal{Z}(s_n, s_n + h)}{v(h)} - l_{s_n}\right|\right) \\ & \leq 6\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

We have thus shown that

$$\mathbb{P}(l_t > (1 + \delta)l_{s_n} + \varepsilon) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 0. \quad (18)$$

So, $\mathbb{P}(l_t - (1 + \delta)\tilde{l}_t > \varepsilon) = 0$ for every $\varepsilon > 0$, implying that $l_t \leq (1 + \delta)\tilde{l}_t$, $\mathbb{P}$ a.s. This leads us to the claim $l_t \leq \tilde{l}_t$ a.s. Since we saw that $\mathbb{E}(l_t) = \mathbb{E}(\tilde{l}_t)$, we have $l_t = \tilde{l}_t$ $\mathbb{P}$ a.s. for every $t \geq 0$.

Now, $(\tilde{l}_t, t \geq 0)$ is a right-continuous supermartingale. Thus, $(\tilde{l}_t, t \geq 0)$ is also left-limited and we have $\mathbb{E}(\tilde{l}_t) \leq \mathbb{E}(\tilde{l}_{t-})$ for every $t > 0$. Moreover, we can prove in the same way as we did for (18) that, for every $t > 0$ and every sequence $(s_n, n \geq 0)$ in D such that $s_n \uparrow t$ as $n \uparrow \infty$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\tilde{l}_{s_n} > (1 + \delta)\tilde{l}_t + \varepsilon) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 0,$$

implying that $\tilde{l}_{t-} \leq \tilde{l}_t$, $\mathbb{P}$ a.s. So, $l_t = l_{t-}$ $\mathbb{P}$ a.s. for every $t > 0$ meaning that $(\tilde{l}_t, t \geq 0)$ has no fixed discontinuities. $\square$

From now on, to simplify notation, we replace $(l_t, t \geq 0)$ by its càdlàg modification $(\tilde{l}_t, t \geq 0)$.

3.1.3 The CSBP

We will prove that the suitably rescaled family of Galton-Watson processes $(\mathcal{X}^\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon > 0}$ converges to the local time l .

Thanks to Lemma 3.1, we can define a sequence $(\eta_n)_{n \geq 1}$ by the condition $v(\eta_n) = n$ for every $n \geq 1$. We set $m_n = \lfloor \eta_n^{-1} \rfloor$ where $\lfloor x \rfloor$ denotes the integer part of x . We recall from Proposition 3.4 that $\mathcal{X}^{\eta_n}$ is a Galton-Watson process on $(\Omega, \mathbb{P})$ whose initial distribution is the Poisson distribution with parameter n . For every $n \geq 1$, we define a process $\mathcal{Y}^n = (\mathcal{Y}_t^n, t \geq 0)$ on $(\Omega, \mathbb{P})$ by the following formula,

$$\mathcal{Y}_t^n = n^{-1}\mathcal{X}_{\lfloor m_n t \rfloor}^{\eta_n}, \quad t \geq 0.$$

Proposition 3.11 *For every $t \geq 0$, $\mathcal{Y}_t^n \longrightarrow l_t$ in probability as $n \longrightarrow \infty$.*

PROOF: The result for $t = 0$ is a consequence of the definition of l_0 together with simple estimates for the Poisson distribution. Let $t, \delta > 0$. We can write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{Y}_t^n - l_t| > 2\delta) &\leq \mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{Y}_t^n - l_{\eta_n[m_n t]}| > \delta) + \mathbb{P}(|l_{\eta_n[m_n t]} - l_t| > \delta) \\ &\leq \delta^{-1} \mathbb{E}(|\mathcal{Y}_t^n - l_{\eta_n[m_n t]}|) + \mathbb{P}(|l_{\eta_n[m_n t]} - l_t| > \delta). \end{aligned}$$

Now, Corollary 3.7 and Proposition 3.8 imply respectively that

$$\mathbb{E}(|\mathcal{Y}_t^n - l_{\eta_n[m_n t]}|) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}(|l_{\eta_n[m_n t]} - l_t| > \delta) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0,$$

which completes the proof. $\square$

Corollary 3.12 *For every $t \geq 0$, the law of $\mathcal{Y}_t^n$ under $\mathbb{P}(\cdot \mid \mathcal{X}_0^{\eta_n} = n)$ converges weakly to the law of l_t under $\mathbb{P}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

PROOF: For positive integers n and k , we denote by μ^n the offspring distribution of the Galton-Watson process $\mathcal{X}^{\eta_n}$, by f^n the generating function of μ^n and by f_k^n the k -th iterate $f_k^n = f^n \circ \dots \circ f^n$ of f^n . Let $\lambda > 0$ and $t \geq 0$. We have,

$$\mathbb{E}(\exp(-\lambda \mathcal{Y}_t^n)) = \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} e^{-n} \frac{n^p}{p!} (f_{[m_n t]}^n(e^{-\lambda/n}))^p = \exp(-n(1 - f_{[m_n t]}^n(e^{-\lambda/n}))).$$

From Proposition 3.11, it holds that

$$\exp(-n(1 - f_{[m_n t]}^n(e^{-\lambda/n}))) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(\exp(-\lambda l_t)).$$

Let us set $u(t, \lambda) = -\log(\mathbb{E}[\exp(-\lambda l_t)])$. It follows that,

$$n(1 - f_{[m_n t]}^n(e^{-\lambda/n})) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} u(t, \lambda).$$

Thus, we obtain,

$$\mathbb{E}(\exp(-\lambda \mathcal{Y}_t^n) \mid \mathcal{X}_0^{\eta_n} = n) = (f_{[m_n t]}^n(e^{-\lambda/n}))^n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \exp(-u(t, \lambda)) = \mathbb{E}[\exp(-\lambda l_t)].$$

$\square$

At this point, we can use Theorem 2.1 to assert that $(l_t, t \geq 0)$ is a CSBP and that the law of $(\mathcal{Y}_t^n, t \geq 0)$ under the probability measure $\mathbb{P}(\cdot \mid \mathcal{X}_0^{\eta_n} = n)$ converges to the law of $(l_t, t \geq 0)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in the space of probability measures on the Skorokhod space $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{R}_+)$. To verify the assumptions of Theorem 2.1, we need to check that there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\mathbb{P}(l_\delta > 0) > 0$. This is obvious from Lemma 3.9.

3.2 Identification of the measure Θ

In the previous section, we have constructed from Θ a CSBP l , which becomes extinct almost surely. We denote by ψ the associated branching mechanism. We can consider the σ -finite measure Θ_ψ , which is the law of the Lévy tree associated with l . Our goal is to show that the measures Θ and Θ_ψ coincide.

Recall that μ^n denotes the offspring distribution of the Galton-Watson process $\mathcal{X}^{\eta_n}$.

Lemma 3.13 *For every $a > 0$, the law of the $\mathbb{R}$ -tree $\eta_n \mathcal{T}^\theta$ under $\Pi_{\mu^n}(\cdot \mid \mathcal{H}(\theta) \geq [am_n])$ converges as $n \rightarrow \infty$ to the probability measure $\Theta_\psi(\cdot \mid \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) > a)$ in the sense of weak convergence of measures in the space $\mathbb{T}$.*

PROOF: We first check that, for every $\delta > 0$,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y}_\delta^n = 0) > 0. \quad (19)$$

Indeed, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y}_\delta^n = 0) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) > ([m_n \delta] + 1)\eta_n) = 0) = \exp(-v([m_n \delta] + 1)\eta_n).$$

As v is continuous, it follows that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y}_\delta^n = 0) \rightarrow \exp(-v(\delta))$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ implying (19).

We recall that the law of $\mathcal{Y}^n$ under the probability measure $\mathbb{P}(\cdot \mid \mathcal{X}_0^{\eta_n} = n)$ converges to the law of $(l_t, t \geq 0)$. Then, thanks to (19), we can apply Theorem 2.3 to get that, for every $a > 0$, the law of the $\mathbb{R}$ -tree $m_n^{-1} \mathcal{T}^\theta$ under $\Pi_{\mu^n}(\cdot \mid \mathcal{H}(\theta) \geq [am_n])$ converges to the probability measure $\Theta_\psi(\cdot \mid \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) > a)$ in the sense of weak convergence of measures in the space $\mathbb{T}$. As $m_n^{-1} \eta_n \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we get the desired result. $\square$

We can now complete the proof of Theorem 1.1. Indeed, thanks to Lemmas 2.2 and 3.3, we can construct on the same probability space $(\Omega, \mathbf{P})$, a sequence of $\mathbb{T}$ -valued random variables $(\mathcal{T}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ distributed according to $\Theta(\cdot \mid \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) > ([am_n] + 1)\eta_n)$ and a sequence of $\mathcal{A}$ -valued random variables $(\theta_n)_{n \geq 1}$ distributed according to $\Pi_{\mu^n}(\cdot \mid \mathcal{H}(\theta) \geq [am_n])$ such that for every $n \geq 1$, $\mathbf{P}$ a.s.,

$$d_{GH}(\mathcal{T}_n, \eta_n \mathcal{T}^{\theta_n}) \leq 4\eta_n.$$

Then, using Lemma 3.13, we have $\Theta(\cdot \mid \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) > ([am_n] + 1)\eta_n) \rightarrow \Theta_\psi(\cdot \mid \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) > a)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in the sense of weak convergence of measures on the space $\mathbb{T}$. So we get

$$\Theta(\cdot \mid \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) > a) = \Theta_\psi(\cdot \mid \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) > a)$$

for every $a > 0$, and thus $\Theta = \Theta_\psi$.

4 Proof of Theorem 1.2

Let Θ be a probability measure on $(\mathbb{T}, d_{GH})$ satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 1.2.

In this case, we define $v : [0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ by $v(t) = \Theta(\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) > t)$ for every $t \geq 0$. Note that $v(0) = 1$ is well defined here. For every $t > 0$, we denote by Θ^t the probability measure $\Theta(\cdot \mid \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) > t)$. The following two results are proved in a similar way to Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2.

Lemma 4.1 *The function v is nonincreasing, continuous and goes to 0 as $t \rightarrow \infty$.*

Lemma 4.2 *For every $t > 0$ and $0 < a < b$, the conditional law of the random variable $Z(t, t+b)$, under the probability measure Θ^t and given $Z(t, t+a)$, is a binomial distribution with parameters $Z(t, t+a)$ and $v(b)/v(a)$.*

4.1 The DSBP derived from Θ

We will follow the same strategy as in section 3 but instead of a CSBP we will now construct an integer-valued branching process.

4.1.1 A family of Galton-Watson trees

We recall that μ_ε denotes the law of $Z(\varepsilon, 2\varepsilon)$ under the probability measure Θ^ε , and that $(\theta_\xi, \xi \in \mathbb{A})$ is a sequence of independent $\mathcal{A}$ -valued random variables defined on a probability space $(\Omega', \mathbb{P}')$ such that for every $\xi \in \mathbb{A}$, θ_ξ is distributed uniformly over $\mathfrak{p}^{-1}(\xi)$. The following lemma is proved in the same way as Lemma 3.3.

Lemma 4.3 *Let us define for every $\varepsilon > 0$, a mapping $\theta^{(\varepsilon)}$ from $\mathbb{T}^{(\varepsilon)} \times \Omega'$ into $\mathcal{A}$ by*

$$\theta^{(\varepsilon)}(\mathcal{T}, \omega) = \theta_{\xi^\varepsilon(\mathcal{T})}(\omega).$$

Then for every positive integer p , the law of the random variable $\theta^{(\varepsilon)}$ under the probability measure $\Theta^{p\varepsilon} \otimes \mathbb{P}'$ is $\Pi_{\mu_\varepsilon}(\cdot \mid \mathcal{H}(\theta) \geq p - 1)$.

For every $\varepsilon > 0$, we define a process $X^\varepsilon = (X_k^\varepsilon, k \geq 0)$ on $\mathbb{T}$ by the formula

$$X_k^\varepsilon = Z(k\varepsilon, (k+1)\varepsilon), \quad k \geq 0.$$

We show in the same way as Proposition 3.4 and Proposition 3.5 the following two results.

Proposition 4.4 *For every $\varepsilon > 0$, the process X^ε is under Θ a Galton-Watson process whose initial distribution is the Bernoulli distribution with parameter $v(\varepsilon)$ and whose offspring distribution is μ_ε .*

Proposition 4.5 *For every $t > 0$ and $h > 0$, we have $\Theta(Z(t, t+h)) \leq v(h) \leq 1$.*

The next proposition however is particular to the finite case and will be useful in the rest of this section.

Proposition 4.6 *The family of probability measures $(\mu_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon>0}$ converges to the Dirac measure δ_1 as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. In other words,*

$$\Theta^\varepsilon(Z(\varepsilon, 2\varepsilon) = 1) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} 1.$$

PROOF: We first note that

$$2\Theta^\varepsilon(Z(\varepsilon, 2\varepsilon) \geq 1) - \Theta^\varepsilon(Z(\varepsilon, 2\varepsilon)) \leq \Theta^\varepsilon(Z(\varepsilon, 2\varepsilon) = 1) \leq \Theta^\varepsilon(Z(\varepsilon, 2\varepsilon) \geq 1).$$

Moreover, $\Theta^\varepsilon(Z(\varepsilon, 2\varepsilon) \geq 1) = \Theta^\varepsilon(\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) > 2\varepsilon) = v(2\varepsilon)/v(\varepsilon)$ and $\Theta^\varepsilon(Z(\varepsilon, 2\varepsilon)) \leq 1$. So,

$$\frac{2v(2\varepsilon)}{v(\varepsilon)} - 1 \leq \Theta^\varepsilon(Z(\varepsilon, 2\varepsilon) = 1) \leq \frac{v(2\varepsilon)}{v(\varepsilon)}. \quad (20)$$

We let $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ in (20) and we use Lemma 4.1 to obtain the desired result. $\square$

4.1.2 Construction of the DSBP

Proposition 4.7 *For every $t \geq 0$, there exists an integer-valued random variable L_t on the space $\mathbb{T}$ such that $\Theta(L_t) \leq 1$ and Θ a.s.,*

$$Z(t, t+h) \xrightarrow{h \downarrow 0} L_t.$$

PROOF: Let $t \geq 0$. The function $h \in (0, \infty) \mapsto Z(t, t+h) \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ is nonincreasing so that there exists a random variable L_t with values in $\mathbb{Z}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$ such that, Θ a.s.,

$$Z(t, t+h) \xrightarrow{h \downarrow 0} L_t.$$

Thanks to the monotone convergence theorem, we have

$$\Theta(Z(t, t+h)) \xrightarrow{h \rightarrow 0} \Theta(L_t).$$

Now, by Proposition 4.5, $\Theta(Z(t, t+h)) \leq 1$ for every $h > 0$. Then, $\Theta(L_t) \leq 1$ which implies in particular that $L_t < \infty$ Θ a.s. $\square$

Proposition 4.8 *For every $t > 0$, the following two convergences hold Θ a.s.,*

$$Z(t-h, t) \xrightarrow{h \downarrow 0} L_t, \quad (21)$$

$$Z(t-h, t+h) \xrightarrow{h \downarrow 0} L_t. \quad (22)$$

PROOF: Let $t > 0$ be fixed throughout this proof. By the same arguments as in the proof of Proposition 4.7, we can find a $\mathbb{Z}_+$ -valued random variable $\bar{L}_t$ such that $\Theta(\bar{L}_t) \leq 1$ and $Z(t-h, t) \uparrow \bar{L}_t$ as $h \downarrow 0$, Θ a.s. If $h \in (0, t)$, we write $\mathcal{T}^1, \dots, \mathcal{T}^{Z(t-h, t)}$ for the subtrees of $\mathcal{T}$ above level $t-h$ with height greater than h . Then, from the regenerative property,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Theta(|Z(t, t+h) - Z(t-h, t)| \geq 1) \\
&= \Theta\left(\Theta\left(\left|\sum_{i=1}^{Z(t-h, t)} (Z(h, 2h)(\mathcal{T}^i) - 1)\right| \geq 1 \mid Z(t-h, t)\right)\right) \\
&\leq \Theta\left(\Theta(|Z(h, 2h)(\mathcal{T}^i) - 1| \geq 1 \text{ for some } i \in \{1, \dots, Z(t-h, t)\} \mid Z(t-h, t))\right) \\
&\leq \Theta(Z(t-h, t)\Theta^h(|Z(h, 2h) - 1| \geq 1)). \tag{23}
\end{aligned}$$

Since $Z(t-h, t)\Theta^h(|Z(h, 2h) - 1| \geq 1) \leq \bar{L}_t$ Θ a.s., Proposition 4.6 and the dominated convergence theorem imply that the right-hand side of (23) goes to 0 as $h \rightarrow 0$. Thus $L_t = \bar{L}_t$ Θ a.s.

Likewise, there exists a random variable $\hat{L}_t$ with values in $\mathbb{Z}_+$ such that, Θ a.s., $Z(t-h, t+h) \uparrow \hat{L}_t$ as $h \downarrow 0$. Let us now notice that, for every $h > 0$, Θ a.s., $Z(t-h, t+h) \leq Z(t-h, t)$. Moreover, thanks to Lemma 4.2, we have

$$\Theta(Z(t-h, t) \geq Z(t-h, t+h) + 1) = 1 - \Theta\left(\left(\frac{v(2h)}{v(h)}\right)^{Z(t-h, t)}\right) \geq 1 - \Theta\left(\left(\frac{v(2h)}{v(h)}\right)^{L_t}\right). \tag{24}$$

The right-hand side of (24) tends to 0 as $h \rightarrow 0$. So $L_t = \hat{L}_t$ Θ a.s. $\square$

We will now establish a regularity property of the process $(L_t, t \geq 0)$.

Proposition 4.9 *The process $(L_t, t \geq 0)$ admits a modification which is right-continuous with left limits, and which has no fixed discontinuities.*

PROOF: We start the proof with three lemmas. The first one is proved in a similar but easier way as Lemma 3.9.

Lemma 4.10 *There exists $\lambda \geq 0$ such that $\Theta(L_t) = e^{-\lambda t}$ for every $t \geq 0$.*

For every $n \geq 1$ and every $t \geq 0$ we set $Y_t^n = X_{[nt]}^{1/n}$.

Lemma 4.11 *For every $t \geq 0$, $Y_t^n \rightarrow L_t$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, Θ a.s.*

This lemma is an immediate consequence of Proposition 4.8.

Lemma 4.12 *Let us define $G_t = \sigma(L_s, s \leq t)$ for every $t \geq 0$. Then $(L_t, t \geq 0)$ is a nonnegative supermartingale with respect to the filtration $(G_t, t \geq 0)$.*

PROOF: Let $s, t, s_1, \dots, s_p \geq 0$ such that $0 \leq s_1 \leq \dots \leq s_p \leq s < t$ and let $f : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be a bounded measurable function. For every $n \geq 1$, the offspring distribution $\mu_{1/n}$ is critical or subcritical so that $(X_k^{1/n}, k \geq 0)$ is a supermartingale. Thus we have

$$\Theta \left(X_{[nt]}^{1/n} f \left(X_{[ns_1]}^{1/n}, \dots, X_{[ns_p]}^{1/n} \right) \right) \leq \Theta \left(X_{[ns]}^{1/n} f \left(X_{[ns_1]}^{1/n}, \dots, X_{[ns_p]}^{1/n} \right) \right).$$

Lemma 4.11 yields $\Theta (L_t f (L_{s_1}, \dots, L_{s_p})) \leq \Theta (L_s f (L_{s_1}, \dots, L_{s_p}))$ since f is bounded and $X_u^{1/n} \leq L_u$ Θ a.s. for every $u \geq 0$. $\square$

Let us set, for every $t \geq 0$,

$$\tilde{G}_t = \bigcap_{s > t} G_s.$$

Recall that D denotes the set of positive dyadic numbers. From Lemma 4.12 and classical results on supermartingales, we can define a right-continuous supermartingale $(\tilde{L}_t, t \geq 0)$ with respect to the filtration $(\tilde{G}_t, t \geq 0)$ by setting, for every $t \geq 0$,

$$\tilde{L}_t = \lim_{s \downarrow t, s \in D} L_s \quad (25)$$

where the limit holds Θ a.s. and in L^1 . In a way similar to Section 3 we can prove that $(\tilde{L}_t, t \geq 0)$ is a càdlàg modification of $(L_t, t \geq 0)$ with no fixed discontinuities.

From now on, to simplify notation we replace $(L_t, t \geq 0)$ by its càdlàg modification $(\tilde{L}_t, t \geq 0)$.

Proposition 4.13 *$(L_t, t \geq 0)$ is a DSBP which becomes extinct Θ a.s.*

PROOF: By the same arguments as in the proof of (21), we can prove that, for every $0 < s < t$, the following convergence holds in probability under Θ ,

$$Z \left(\frac{[nt] - [ns]}{n}, \frac{[nt] - [ns] + 1}{n} \right) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} L_{t-s}. \quad (26)$$

Let $s, t, s_1, \dots, s_p \geq 0$ such that $0 \leq s_1 \leq \dots \leq s_p \leq s < t$, $\lambda > 0$ and let $f : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded measurable function. For every $n \geq 1$, under $\Theta^{1/n}$, $(X_k^{1/n}, k \geq 0)$ is a Galton-Watson process started at one so that

$$\Theta^{1/n} (f(Y_{s_1}^n, \dots, Y_{s_p}^n) \exp(-\lambda Y_t^n)) = \Theta^{1/n} \left(f(Y_{s_1}^n, \dots, Y_{s_p}^n) (\Theta^{1/n} (\exp(-\lambda X_{[nt]-[ns]}^{1/n})))^{Y_s^n} \right).$$

From Lemma 4.11, (26) and dominated convergence, we get

$$\Theta (f(L_{s_1}, \dots, L_{s_p}) \exp(-\lambda L_t)) = \Theta \left(f(L_{s_1}, \dots, L_{s_p}) (\Theta (\exp(-\lambda L_{t-s})))^{L_s} \right).$$

Then, $(L_t, t \geq 0)$ is a continuous-time Markov chain with values in $\mathbb{Z}_+$ satisfying the branching property. Furthermore, since $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) < \infty$ Θ a.s., it is immediate that $(L_t, t \geq 0)$ becomes extinct Θ a.s. $\square$

4.2 Identification of the probability measure Θ

Let us now define, for every $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$ and $t \geq 0$, $N_t(\mathcal{T}) = \#\{\sigma \in \mathcal{T} : d(\rho, \sigma) = t\}$ where we recall that ρ denotes the root of $\mathcal{T}$.

Proposition 4.14 *For every $t \geq 0$, $N_t = L_t \Theta$ a.s.*

Note that for every $t \geq 0$, L_t is the number of subtrees of $\mathcal{T}$ above level t .

PROOF: Since $\Theta(\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}) = 0) = 0$, we have $L_0 = 1 = N_0 \Theta$ a.s. Thanks to Propositions 4.7, 4.8 and 4.9, for every $t > 0$, Θ a.s., there exists $h_0 > 0$ such that for every $h \in (0, h_0]$, $L_t = L_{t-h} = L_{t+h} = Z(t-h, t+h)$.

The remaining part of the argument is deterministic. We fix $t, h_0 > 0$ and a (deterministic) tree $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}$. We assume that there is a positive integer p such that for every $h \in (0, h_0]$,

$$L_t = L_{t-h} = L_{t+h} = Z(t-h, t+h) = p,$$

and we will verify that $N_t(\mathcal{T}) = p$. We denote by $\mathcal{T}^1, \dots, \mathcal{T}^p$ the p subtrees of $\mathcal{T}$ above level $t - h_0$ and we write ρ_i for the root of the subtree $\mathcal{T}^i$. For every $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, we have $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}^i) > 2h_0$ so that there exists $x_i \in \mathcal{T}^i$ such that $d(\rho_i, x_i) = 2h_0$. Let us prove that for every $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$,

$$\mathcal{T}_{\leq 2h_0}^i = \{\sigma \in \mathcal{T}^i : d(\rho_i, \sigma) \leq 2h_0\} = [[\rho_i, x_i]]. \quad (27)$$

To this end, we argue by contradiction and assume that we can find $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ and $t_i \in \mathcal{T}^i$ such that $d(\rho_i, t_i) \leq 2h_0$ and $t_i \notin [[\rho_i, x_i]]$. Let z_i be the unique vertex of $\mathcal{T}^i$ satisfying $[[\rho_i, z_i]] = [[\rho_i, x_i]] \cap [[\rho_i, t_i]]$. We choose $c > 0$ such that $d(\rho_i, z_i) < c < d(\rho_i, t_i)$. Then it is not difficult to see that $\mathcal{T}$ has at least $p + 1$ subtrees above level $t - h_0 + c$. This is a contradiction since $L_{t-h_0+c} = p$. So $N_t(\mathcal{T}) = p$, which completes the proof. $\square$

Proposition 4.14 means that $(L_t, t \geq 0)$ is a modification of the process $(N_t, t \geq 0)$ which describes the evolution of the number of individuals in the tree. Let us denote by Q the generator of $(L_t, t \geq 0)$ which is of the form

$$Q = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ a\gamma(0) & -a & a\gamma(2) & a\gamma(3) & a\gamma(4) & \dots \\ 0 & 2a\gamma(0) & -2a & 2a\gamma(2) & a\gamma(3) & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & 3a\gamma(0) & -3a & 3a\gamma(2) & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \end{pmatrix},$$

where $a > 0$ and γ is a critical or subcritical offspring distribution with $\gamma(1) = 0$.

For every $t \geq 0$ we let $\mathcal{F}_t$ be the σ -field on $\mathbb{T}$ generated by the mapping $\mathcal{T} \mapsto \mathcal{T}_{\leq t}$ and completed with respect to Θ . Thus $(\mathcal{F}_t, t \geq 0)$ is a filtration on $\mathbb{T}$.

Lemma 4.15 *Let $t > 0$ and $p \in \mathbb{N}$. Under Θ , conditionally on $\mathcal{F}_t$ and given $\{L_t = p\}$, the p subtrees of $\mathcal{T}$ above level t are independent and distributed according to Θ .*

PROOF: Thanks to Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 4.3, we can construct on the same probability space $(\Omega, \mathbf{P})$, a sequence of $\mathbb{T}$ -valued random variables $(\mathcal{T}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ distributed according to $\Theta^{1/n}$ and a sequence of $\mathcal{A}$ -valued random variables $(\theta_n)_{n \geq 1}$ distributed according to $\Pi_{\mu_{1/n}}$ such that, for every $n \geq 1$,

$$d_{GH}(\mathcal{T}_n, n^{-1}\mathcal{T}^{\theta_n}) \leq 4n^{-1}. \quad (28)$$

For every $n \geq 1$ and $k \geq 0$, we define $\mathbf{X}_k^n = \#\{u \in \theta_n : |u| = k\}$. Let $t \geq 0$ and $p \geq 1$, let $g : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded continuous function and let $G : \mathbb{T}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded continuous symmetric function. For $n \geq 1$, on the event $\{\mathbf{X}_{[nt]}^n = p\}$, we set $\{u_1^n, \dots, u_p^n\} = \{u \in \theta_n : |u| = [nt]\}$ and $\theta_n^i = \tau_{u_i^n} \theta_n$ for every $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$. Then we can write, thanks to the branching property of Galton-Watson trees,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{E} \left(\mathbb{1}_{\{\mathbf{X}_{[nt]}^n = p\}} g \left(n^{-1} \mathcal{T}_{\leq [nt]}^{\theta_n} \right) G \left(n^{-1} \mathcal{T}^{\theta_n^1}, \dots, n^{-1} \mathcal{T}^{\theta_n^p} \right) \right) \\ &= \mathbf{E} \left(\mathbb{1}_{\{\mathbf{X}_{[nt]}^n = p\}} g \left(n^{-1} \mathcal{T}_{\leq [nt]}^{\theta_n} \right) \right) (\Pi_{\mu_{1/n}})^{\otimes p} (G(n^{-1} \mathcal{T}^{\theta_1}, \dots, n^{-1} \mathcal{T}^{\theta_p})), \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_p$ denote the coordinate variables under the product measure $(\Pi_{\mu_{1/n}})^{\otimes p}$. As a consequence of (28), we see that the law of $n^{-1} \mathcal{T}^{\theta}$ under $\Pi_{\mu_{1/n}}$ converges to Θ in the sense of weak convergence of measures on the space $\mathbb{T}$. Then, thanks to Lemma 4.11, the right-hand side of (29) converges as $n \rightarrow \infty$ to

$$\Theta \left(\mathbb{1}_{\{L_t = p\}} g(\mathcal{T}_{\leq t}) \right) \Theta^{\otimes p}(G(\mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_p)).$$

Similarly, the left-hand side of (29) converges as $n \rightarrow \infty$ to

$$\Theta \left(\mathbb{1}_{\{L_t = p\}} g(\mathcal{T}_{\leq t}) G(\mathcal{T}^1, \dots, \mathcal{T}^p) \right),$$

where $\mathcal{T}^1, \dots, \mathcal{T}^p$ are the p subtrees of $\mathcal{T}$ above level t on the event $\{L_t = p\}$. This completes the proof. $\square$

Let us define $J = \inf\{t \geq 0 : L_t \neq 1\}$. Then J is an $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ -stopping time.

Lemma 4.16 *Let $p \in \mathbb{N}$. Under Θ , given $\{L_J = p\}$, the p subtrees of $\mathcal{T}$ above level J are independent and distributed according to Θ , and are independent of J .*

PROOF: Let $p \in \mathbb{N}$, let $f : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded continuous function and let $G : \mathbb{T}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded continuous symmetric function. On the event $\{L_J = p\}$, we denote by $\mathcal{T}^1, \dots, \mathcal{T}^p$ the p subtrees of $\mathcal{T}$ above level J . Let $n \geq 1$ and $k \geq 0$. On the event $\{L_{(k+1)/n} = p\}$, we denote by $\mathcal{T}^{1,(n,k)}, \dots, \mathcal{T}^{p,(n,k)}$ the p subtrees of $\mathcal{T}$ above level $(k+1)/n$. On the one hand, the right-continuity of the mapping $t \mapsto L_t$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \Theta \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}_{\{L_{(k+1)/n} = p\}} G(\mathcal{T}^{1,(n,k)}, \dots, \mathcal{T}^{p,(n,k)}) f((k+1)/n) \mathbb{1}_{\{k/n < J \leq (k+1)/n\}} \right) \\ & \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \Theta \left(\mathbb{1}_{\{L_J = p\}} G(\mathcal{T}^1, \dots, \mathcal{T}^p) f(J) \right). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, thanks to Lemma 4.15, we can write for every $n \geq 1$ and $k \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \Theta \left(\mathbb{1}_{\{L_{(k+1)/n}=p\}} G(\mathcal{T}^{1,(n,k)}, \dots, \mathcal{T}^{p,(n,k)}) f((k+1)/n) \mathbb{1}_{\{k/n < J \leq (k+1)/n\}} \right) \\ &= \Theta \left(\mathbb{1}_{\{L_{(k+1)/n}=p\}} f((k+1)/n) \mathbb{1}_{\{k/n < J \leq (k+1)/n\}} \right) \Theta^{\otimes p}(G(\mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_p)). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\Theta(\mathbb{1}_{\{L_J=p\}} G(\mathcal{T}^1, \dots, \mathcal{T}^p) f(J)) = \Theta(\mathbb{1}_{\{L_J=p\}} f(J)) \Theta^{\otimes p}(G(\mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_p))$. $\square$

We can now complete the proof of Theorem 1.2. The random variable J is the first jump time of the DSBP $(L_t, t \geq 0)$ so that J is distributed according to the exponential distribution with parameter a and is independent of L_J . Thanks to Proposition 4.14, there exists $\sigma_J \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $\mathcal{T}_{\leq J} = [[\rho, \sigma_J]]$. Lemma 4.16 gives the last part of the description of Θ .

Another way to describe Θ is as follows: Assume that we are given on the same probability space $(\Omega, \mathbf{P})$ an $\mathcal{A}$ -valued random variable θ distributed according to Π_γ and an independent sequence of independent random variables $(\mathbf{h}_u, u \in U)$ with values in $[0, \infty)$, such that each variable $\mathbf{h}_u$ is distributed according to the exponential distribution with parameter a . We set $\mathbf{T} = (\theta, \{\mathbf{h}_u\}_{u \in \theta})$ and $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}^{\mathbf{T}}$. Then the random variable $\mathcal{T}$ is distributed according to Θ .

References

- [1] ALDOUS, D. (1991) The continuum random tree I. *Ann. Probab.* **19**, 1-28.
- [2] ALDOUS, D. (1993) The continuum random tree III. *Ann. Probab.* **21**, 248-289.
- [3] ATHREYA, K.B., NEY, P.E. (1972) *Branching Processes*. Springer, Berlin.
- [4] BURAGO, D., BURAGO, Y., IVANOV, S. (2001) *A Course in Metric Geometry*. Graduate studies in mathematics, vol.33, AMS, Boston.
- [5] DELLACHERIE, C., MEYER, P.A. (1980) *Probabilités et Potentiels, Chapitres V à VIII: Théorie des Martingales*. Hermann, Paris.
- [6] DUQUESNE, T., LE GALL, J.F. (2002) Random Trees, Lévy Processes and Spatial Branching Processes, *Astérisque* **281**.
- [7] DUQUESNE, T., LE GALL, J.F. (2005) Probabilistic and fractal aspects of Lévy trees. *Probab. Th. Rel. Fields*, **131**, 553-603.
- [8] EVANS, S.N., PITMAN, J.W., WINTER, A. (2003) Rayleigh processes, real trees and root growth with re-grafting. *Probab. Th. Rel. Fields*, to appear.
- [9] EVANS, S.N., WINTER, A. Subtree prune and re-graft: A reversible tree valued Markov process. *Ann. Probab.*, to appear.

- [10] GRIMVALL, A. (1974) On the convergence of sequences of branching processes. *Ann. Probab.* **2** 1027-1045.
- [11] LAMPERTI, J. (1966) The limit of a sequence of branching processes. *Z. Wahrsch. verw. Gebiete* **7** 271-288.
- [12] MIERMONT, G. (2003) Self-similar fragmentations derived from the stable tree I: splitting at heights. *Probab. Th. Rel. Fields*, **127**, 423-454.
- [13] MIERMONT, G. (2004) Self-similar fragmentations derived from the stable tree II: splitting at nodes. *Probab. Th. Rel. Fields*, to appear.
- [14] NORRIS, J. (1997) *Markov Chains*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.